

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
)	
)	
v.)	
)	
JOHN BRUENS, MARY STEWART,)	
MELISSA VAUGHN, and)	
MARC SIROCKMAN)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

NO. 05-CR-10102 JLT

**SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY FOR DEFENDANTS'
PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION NO. 31**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 30, the Defendants respectfully submit this Supplemental Authority for Proposed Jury Instruction No. 31.

**JOHN BRUENS, MARY STEWART,
MELISSA VAUGHN, and MARC SIROCKMAN,**

By their undersigned attorneys.

/s/ McKenzie E. Webster
Tracy A. Miner
McKenzie E. Webster
Counsel for Marc Sirockman

/s/ Thomas McC. Souther
Thomas McC. Souther
Counsel for John Bruens

/s/ Mark. A. Berman
Mark A. Berman
Counsel for Mary Stewart

/s/ Adam S. Hoffinger
Adam S. Hoffinger
Counsel for Melissa Vaughn

Dated: May 1, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing motion was filed electronically in compliance with ECF procedures on this 1st day of May 2007.

/s/ McKenzie E. Webster

DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCCION NO. 31

Good Faith Defense

Supplemental Authority:

See United States v. MacKenzie, et al., CR-01-10350 (D. Mass. 2004) (actual transcript of good faith instruction given to jury attached as Exhibit A). Judge Woodlock instructed the jury as follows:

“There is another dimension to the state of mind aspects of the fourth element requiring that the government show the particular defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and with specific intent. It is the issue of whether there was lack of good faith.

A defendant's good faith that his or her conduct was lawful is a defense to the charge of violating or aiding and abetting the violation or conspiring to violate the anti-kickback statute. This is because good faith, as I'll define it for you, is inconsistent with that knowledge or willfulness or specific intent that it is necessary for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to establish a violation of the anti-kickback statute.

If a defendant acted in the belief or with an opinion he or she honestly held that his or her actions were not criminal, that defendant's actions are not criminal simply because the belief or opinion is inaccurate or incorrect or wrong. A person's honest mistake of judgment does not fall to the level of criminal conduct that comes within the ambit of the anti-kickback statute merely because the belief or opinion turns out to be inaccurate or incorrect or wrong.

Good faith has no precise definition, but it encompasses, among other things, a belief or opinion honestly held or an intention to avoid taking unfair advantage of circumstances. And so in determining whether the government -- and the government bears this burden -- has proven the defendant's knowledge, willfulness, and specific intent beyond a reasonable doubt, or whether there is a reasonable doubt such that the defendant instead may have acted in good faith, you must consider all of the evidence that bears on his or her state mind.

The burden of proving good faith does not rest with the defendant because, as I told you, no defendant bears a burden to prove anything to you in this case. It is the government's burden to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and with a specific intent. And in this connection, the government must satisfy you that the defendant did not act in good faith.”

TAP Jury Instructions Transcript

0001

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3
4 * * * * *
5 UNITED STATES, *
6 Plaintiff *
7 VERSUS * CR-01-10350-DPW
8 ALAN MACKENZIE, HENRY VAN *
9 MOURIK, DONNA TOM, DONALD PATTON*
ERIC OTTERBEIN, RITA JOKIAHO, *
CAREY SMITH, MARK SMITH, *
10 Defendants *
11 * * * * *

11

12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS P. WOODLOCK
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
14 JURY TRIAL - DAY 49
15 July 9, 2004

16

17 Courtroom No. 1 - 3rd Floor
18 1 Courthouse Way
19 Boston, Massachusetts 02210,
20 9:00 A.M. - 11:45 A.M.

21 Debra M. Joyce
22 Official Court Reporter
23 John Joseph Moakley District Courthouse
1 Courthouse Way - Suite 3204
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

24 Method of Reporting: Computer-Aided Transcription

25

0002

1 APPEARANCES:
2 MICHAEL K. LOUCKS, ESQ., Chief, Health Care Fraud Unit,
3 GEORGE W. VIEN, ESQ., and SUSAN G. WINKLER, ESQ.,
4 Assistant United States Attorneys, U.S. Attorney's Office,
5 1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200, Boston, Massachusetts
6 02210, on behalf of the United States.
7 DAVID J. STETLER, ESQ. and WILLIAM P. ZIEGELMUELLER,
8 ESQ., Stetler & Duffy, Ltd., 11 South LaSalle Street,
9 Suite 1200, Chicago, Illinois 60603, on behalf of Alan
10 Mackenzie, Defendant
11 ROBERT L. ULLMANN, ESQ., and CHRISTA VON DER LUFT, Nutter,
12 McClennan & Fish, LLP, World Trade Center West, 155
13 Seaport Blvd., Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2699, on
14 behalf of Henry Van Mourik, Defendant
15 ROBERT P. SHERMAN, ESQ., ROBERT L. KIRBY, JR., and
16 MARISA L. JAFFE, ESQ., Nixon, Peabody, LLP, 101 Federal
17 Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 02110, on behalf of
18 Donna Tom, Defendant
19 WILLIAM H. KETTLEWELL, ESQ., DANIEL J. CLOHERTY, ESQ., and
20 SARA E. NOONAN, ESQ., Dwyer & Collora, LLP, 600 Atlantic
21 Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211, on behalf of
22 Donald Patton, Defendant.

TAP Jury Instructions Transcript

0058

1 The government has to prove beyond a reasonable
2 doubt that the defendant was aware of the legal duties imposed
3 by the anti-kickback statute, even if the defendant did not
4 know the specific statute involved, that the defendant knew the
5 conduct was prohibited, and despite that awareness, the
6 defendant nevertheless engaged in conduct with the specific
7 intent to disobey or disregard the known legal duties.

8 There is another dimension to the state of mind
9 aspects of the fourth element requiring that the government
10 show the particular defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and
11 with specific intent. It is the issue of whether there was
12 lack of good faith. A defendant's good faith that his or her
13 conduct was lawful is a defense to the charge of violating or
14 aiding and abetting the violation or conspiring to violate the
15 anti-kickback statute. This is because good faith, as I'll
16 define it for you, is inconsistent with that knowledge or
17 willfulness or specific intent that it is necessary for the
18 government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt to establish a
19 violation of the anti-kickback statute.

20 If a defendant acted in the belief or with an
21 opinion he or she honestly held that his or her actions were
22 not criminal, that defendant's actions are not criminal simply
23 because the belief or opinion is inaccurate or incorrect or
24 wrong. A person's honest mistake of judgment does not fall to
25 the level of criminal conduct that comes within the ambit of

0059

1 the anti-kickback statute merely because the belief or opinion
2 turns out to be inaccurate or incorrect or wrong.

3 Good faith has no precise definition, but it
4 encompasses, among other things, a belief or opinion honestly
5 held or an intention to avoid taking unfair advantage of
6 circumstances. And so in determining whether the government --
7 and the government bears this burden -- has proven the
8 defendant's knowledge, willfulness, and specific intent beyond
9 a reasonable doubt, or whether there is a reasonable doubt such
10 that the defendant instead may have acted in good faith, you
11 must consider all of the evidence that bears on his or her
12 state mind.

13 The burden of proving good faith does not rest with
14 the defendant because, as I told you, no defendant bears a
15 burden to prove anything to you in this case. It is the
16 government's burden to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a
17 defendant acted knowingly, willfully, and with a specific
18 intent. And in this connection, the government must satisfy
19 you that the defendant did not act in good faith.

20 Those are the elements of a substantive violation
21 of the anti-kickback statute. And you'll see from the copy of
22 the indictment you have been provided that counts two through
23 four are charged as substantive violations by Ms. Jokiah in
24 the District of Massachusetts. And let me pause again for a
25 moment to explain a little bit about federal court pleading

0060

1 requirements.

2 There are 94 federal districts in the United
3 States, one of those is the District of Massachusetts. Some
4 states have multiple districts. In New York there are
5 four: northern, southern, eastern, and western. And the way in
6 which the Constitution and federal statutes have organized the
7 allocation of business among the districts is that a criminal
8 charge can only be brought in the district in which either a
9 substantive offense is alleged to have taken place, or with
10 respect to a conspiracy, in which an overt act is alleged to